

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-40 are now pending in this application. The final office action mailed October 17, 2003 rejected claims 1-33. Applicant has added new Claims 34-40. Applicant has amended Claims 25 and 26 to correct minor formalities, and Claims 1, 11, 17, and 27 to further clarify the patentable subject matter of the claimed invention. No Claims have been cancelled. No new matter has been included by the newly presented claims and amended claims, and it is respectfully submitted that each of the present claims find basis and support in the application as filed. For the reasons discussed in detail below, Applicant submits that the pending claims are patentable over the art of record.

**Rejection of Claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 3-10, 17, 19-21, 24, 26-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over U.S. patent No. 6,484,149 to Jammes et al (hereinafter "Jammes"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Jammes does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Amended Claim 1 recites, among other things, a method for extracting data from a network by a server, including (a) creating a database-structured query at the server, wherein at least one parameter of the query is based, in part, on a user input; (b) determining a web domain address on the network from which to extract the data, the web domain address having content; and (c) extracting data from the content at the determined web domain address employing at least one user input based parameter of the database-structured query.

As described in the specification, the disclosed invention employs a structured query language to treat a network as a searchable database. See Specification, Page 8, Lines 25-26; page 3,

lines 2-3. To perform a search a data extraction engine employs database-structured regular expressions to scan website content and return matched data to a tab delimited file. See Specification, Page 9, Lines 1-3. Database-structured regular expressions include user determined parameters such as text, tables, following links, and sequence. See Specification, Page 10, Lines 3-10; Page 11, Lines 4-11, Lines 20-27, Page 12, Lines 8-22. The structured query parameters are defined by the user at the searching server according to the present invention. See Specification, Page 15, Lines 21-30. Thus, the claimed invention treats content of webpages as though they were searchable databases, but does not require a database determined at another webpage.

The difference between the claimed invention and Jammes is very significant. Jammes is limited to using a standard database to perform searches by scanning a template file specified by a URL for query scripts, and does not teach or suggest performing searches on other than standard databases. See Jammes, Col 45, lines 27-42. The claimed invention, on the other hand, treats the content found at a webpage as though it were searchable database, and is not constrained to only using a standard database residing at the queried website. Thus, Jammes does not teach or suggest extracting data from the content at the determined web domain address employing a database-structured query.

Furthermore, Jammes teaches examining a URL itself to locate a template file, which in turn includes a query script. The query specifies that a query be performed against the product information database. See Jammes, Fig. 18, Col. 46, lines 15-32. The present invention employs a structured query that is created at the server based on user input, and not based on query scripts found at other websites. Jammes does not disclose or suggest creating a database-structured query at the server, wherein at least one parameter of the query is based, in part, on a user input.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Jammes does not render the claimed invention obvious.

Amended Claims 11, 17, and 27 are clearly not rendered obvious by Jammes for at least the reasons stated above. Moreover, in regard to Claims 2-10, 12-16, 18-26, and 28-33 which are dependent from amended independent Claims 1, 11 and 17, and 27, respectively, they are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above for those independent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-33 are, therefore, in condition for allowance.

New Claim 34 recites, among other things, “generating a structured query based, in part, on user input”, “determining at least one webpage with the content”, and “parsing the content of the at least one webpage in search of data that satisfies a query condition, wherein the content is processed as though it is a searchable database.” New claim 34 makes clear without adding new matter that the claimed invention searches webpages treating their content as though it is a searchable database, rather than merely using a URL to locate a database from which to a search may be performed. As such, it is clear that Jammes neither discloses nor suggests the claimed invention of Claim 34. Therefore, for at least this reason, Claim 34 should be allowed over the cited art of reference. New independent Claims 39 and 40 recite similar elements, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

The Office Action also rejected Claims 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over U.S. patent No. 6,484,149 to Jammes et al (hereinafter “Jammes”) in view of U.S. patent No. 6,064,979 to Perkowski (hereinafter “Perkowski”).

The Office Action further rejected Claims 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over U.S. patent No. 6,484,149 to Jammes et al (hereinafter "Jammes") in view of U.S. patent No. 6,466,940 to Mills (hereinafter "Mills").

The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. The Applicant respectfully submits that neither Perkowski, nor Mills disclose or suggest creating a database-structured query at the server based, in part, on a user input. Therefore, for at least the same reasons as discussed above, Claims 11-16, and 22-23 are not rendered obvious over the cited art of reference. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 11-16, and 22-23 are, in condition for allowance.

## CONCLUSION

By the foregoing explanations, Applicant believes that this response has responded fully to all of the concerns expressed in the Office Action, and believes that it has placed each of the pending claims in condition for immediate allowance. Early favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is urged. Should any further aspects of the application remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Dated: March 17, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By *Jamie Wiegand*  
 Jamie Wiegand  
 Registration No.: 52,361  
 DARBY & DARBY P.C.  
 P.O. Box 5257  
 New York, New York 10150-5257  
 (206) 262-8915  
 (212) 753-6237 (Fax)  
 Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

CUSTOMER NO.: 07278